Downloaded from: justpaste.it/erin-gerlach-stalked-by-jackson

Speak to the Media, Get Stalked: Arizona's Family Court Declares War on Dissent

Erin Gerlach didn't threaten anyone. She threatened to tell the truth. And for that, Maricopa County Superior Court Judge Charlene Jackson and Arizona's judicial system lost their damn minds.

Gerlach is a protective mother who did what every citizen has the right to do—she spoke up. She filed complaints. She exposed misconduct. She used public records to shine a light on the corruption and outright criminal behavior of a sitting judge. And instead of accountability, she got hunted.

She was stalked. Monitored. Flagged like a threat. Retaliated against by the very system she dared to challenge. All because she had the audacity to say, "Maybe the public should know what's going on in this courtroom."

It's a coordinated crackdown on dissent diguised as justice. And Jackson is leading the charge.

Erin Gerlach threatened to go to the media about her child custody case. That’s the scandal. And Arizona’s judicial system is bending over backwards to make sure she pays for it.

This isn’t just a story about a custody case gone wrong. It’s a masterclass in judicial stalking, institutional retaliation, and constitutional violations so brazen they make Watergate look like amateur hour. The moment Gerlach dared to file complaints and—gasp—mention the media, Judge Charlene Jackson and her buddies in the Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct went full authoritarian.

Gerlach had the nerve to say out loud what everyone else was whispering—calling out the corruption infecting her custody case and the judge’s illegal behavior. Judge Charlene Jackson and her institutional entourage went full Mean Girls in robes. Surveillance, restraining orders, and coordinated intimidation tactics. All because a mother had the audacity to say, “Hey, maybe the public should know what’s happening here.”

The Timeline of Retaliation: Petty, Paranoid, and Pathetic

On March 24, 2025, Arizona Family Court Judge Charlene Jackson filed a personal restraining order against Erin Gerlach, citing eight alleged incidents of “harassment.” Except Jackson was presiding over Gerlach's custody case during the period of the alleged incidents. So either Jackson was fine with being “harassed” for over a year, or she’s retroactively rewriting history to justify her sick obsession. Pick one.

And let’s talk about the timing: the custody case was reassigned mere hours after Gerlach submitted misconduct evidence to the Arizona Supreme Court. Coincidence? Please. Jackson didn’t recuse herself—she clung to that case like it was her personal revenge fantasy. She issued one-word denials, ordered Gerlach to pay attorney’s fees while self-represented, issued warrants, placed a child with her alleged abuser, and coordinated with Gerlach's opposing party to harass and intimidate her.

Her coordination with court security, law enforcement, and the Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct to monitor Gerlach’s online presence and track her speech wasn’t neutral. It was punitive. It was targeted. And it was executed with one goal: shut her up.

She Fought to Protect Her Daughter—The Judge Fought to Silence Her

Judge Charlene Jackson didn't just preside over Erin Gerlach's custody case—she orchestrated a legal ambush. While Gerlach fought to protect her daughter from documented abuse, Jackson twisted the law into a weapon. She ignored jurisdictional boundaries, buried critical rulings in non-appealable minute orders, and issued retaliatory decisions that stripped a protective mother of her rights. Jackson's courtroom wasn't a venue for justice—it was a stage for unchecked ego. She actively participated in Gerlach's custodial interference case, coordinating with the opposing party's law enforcement agency while still assigned to the bench. Her rulings weren't just biased—they were punitive, reckless, and rooted in personal vendetta. Jackson didn't just fail to protect a child—she enabled the interference, concealed evidence, and used her authority to criminalize a mother's advocacy.

Judge Charlene Jackson's Retaliation Playbook: Collusion, Surveillance, and a Whole Lot of Nerve

Let's talk about Judge Charlene Jackson, who apparently thought her job description included "personal investigator" and "constitutional scofflaw." While she was supposed to be ruling on Erin Gerlach's custody case, Jackson was secretly participating in a criminal investigation targeting Gerlach—an investigation launched by the opposing party's employer. Yes, Gerlach's ex. Who works in law enforcement. Because nothing screams "judicial ethics" like teaming up with your litigant's workplace to build a case against the woman you're still actively judging.

Did Jackson disclose this flaming conflict of interest? Not a chance. She kept it tucked away like a dirty little secret until four months after recusing herself, when she casually dropped it in her retaliatory restraining order filing like it was just another Tuesday.

And then came the packages. In one of the most paranoid and frankly embarrassing claims in her sworn filing, Jackson accused Gerlach of anonymously sending packages to the private homes of other judges. Allegedly, they contained materials exposing corruption in Maricopa County Family Court—some referencing Gerlach's case, others naming multiple judges, including Jackson herself. Sounds juicy, right? Too bad there's zero evidence. Just Jackson's word and an alleged phone call from a fellow judge who apparently moonlights as a drama critic.

Gerlach has publicly and consistently denied any involvement. But instead of recusing herself like any judge with a shred of dignity, Jackson doubled down and admitted she was actively participating in the criminal investigation into the packages—while still presiding over Gerlach's case.

And let's talk jurisdiction. According to Jackson's own admission and Judge Ronda Fisk's ruling, the law enforcement agency conducting the investigation had no jurisdiction over Jackson's residence, Gerlach's residence, or the courthouse. So why were they involved? And why was Jackson meeting with them while still issuing rulings?

She didn't disclose any of this at the time. She waited months to casually drop it in a restraining order like it was just another footnote. Shes delusional to think she can get away with such a flaming conflict of interest.

So let's tally this up: a judge working with her litigant's employer, participating in a jurisdictionally invalid investigation, accusing a mother of anonymous mail with no evidence, and possibly pulling private data from law enforcement channels—all while issuing rulings in the same case?

And the kicker? She put it all in writing.

The Article That Broke the System (And Didn't Break the Law)

Judge Jackson also accused Gerlach of writing an anonymous article under a pseudonym, claiming the account was registered to Gerlach's home address. She called it a "pay-to-play" platform like Newsbreak—except the article was published on Medium, which is free, doesn't collect residential addresses, and definitely doesn't hand them out to judges throwing tantrums. So either Jackson lied under oath, or she illegally obtained data. Pick one.

Let's talk logistics. Gerlach has used a P.O. Box for years. So how did Jackson allegedly get her home address? Speculation points to Jackson's husband, reportedly a liaison at a regional fusion center—a law enforcement data hub that's supposed to track terrorists, not pissed-off moms. If Jackson exploited that connection, her connection to Gerlach's ex, court security, or any other law enforcement resource to identify or target a critic, that's not just unethical. That's criminal abuse of state resources for her and her husband at a minimum.

And the article? No threats. No defamation. No illegal content. Just constitutionally protected speech and publicly available records. It criticized Jackson's rulings and cited documents anyone could find. That's not harassment. That's civic engagement. If no laws were broken, then how did Jackson legally link the article to a critics home address?

Spoiler: she didn't. She just proved her own misconduct in writing.

Surveillance as a Response to Free Speech? That's Stalking.

In her own sworn filing, Jackson admitted that the Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct told her Gerlach had filed complaints—and that those complaints included a "threat" to go to the media. Oh no! A woman wants to talk to a reporter! Sound the alarms!

Instead of investigating the complaint like grown-ups, the Commission tattled to court security. Jackson then spoke with them, and suddenly Gerlach's online presence was being monitored for "cyberstalking." Because apparently, filing a complaint and tweeting about it is now a national security threat.

This isn't oversight. It's institutional stalking. And Jackson said it herself, under oath.

Arizona's Constitutional Dumpster Fire

Let's get this straight: speaking to the media about your own case is protected speech. Filing a complaint is a lawful exercise of the right to petition the government. Neither act is harassment. Neither act is a threat. But in Arizona's family court, both are treated like crimes. Why? Because the truth is inconvenient.

The Commission didn't investigate Jackson. They investigated Gerlach. When Gerlach flagged a conflict of interest—Jackson presiding over her niece's case—the Commission didn't say "thank you." They asked how she knew. So Gerlach did their job for them, pulled public records, and handed over the proof. And what did they do? Accuse her of cyberstalking.

You can't make this up. But they sure tried.

Who's the Real Stalker Here?

Let’s flip the script. Jackson remained fixated on Gerlach for over two years. She coordinated surveillance. She issued rulings. She withheld disclosure of alleged threats for 16 months, only revealing them in a restraining order four months after stepping down. That’s not fear. That’s control. That’s obsession.

And it wasn’t just Jackson. The Commission, court security, law enforcement agencies, and according to Jackson her judicial colleagues were all looped in. All watching. All reporting. All stalking. All complicit.

This isn’t one rogue judge. This is a system-wide collapse of integrity.

The Message Is Loud and Clear: Shut Up or Get Watched

The Commission’s behavior sends a message to every litigant, advocate, and journalist: if you speak out, we’ll watch you. We’ll flag you. We’ll punish you. And we’ll call it “security.”

This isn’t just retaliation. It’s a constitutional dumpster fire. And it’s happening in plain sight.

Public officials don’t get privacy when they’re being shady. Gerlach’s use of public records wasn’t just legal—it was necessary. If the Commission had done its job, she wouldn’t have had to.

Instead, they stalked her for it and violated her Constitutional Rights in the process.

So Who Else Is on Their Watchlist?

Thanks to Jackson’s own admissions, we now know that multiple agencies were actively monitoring Gerlach for her "threat" to take her case to the media. So who else is being watched? How many other mothers, protective parents, journalists, and citizens are being flagged for exercising their rights?

We don’t know. And that’s terrifying.

When the machinery of justice turns inward to punish those who seek accountability, every citizen becomes vulnerable. Erin Gerlach exposed a judge committing crimes. And for that, she was stalked by the very institutions sworn to protect her.

This isn’t just about one judge. It’s about a system that punishes truth-tellers and protects abusers. And if Arizona’s family court can do this to one mother, they can do it to anyone.

Learn more about Judge Charlene Jackson's Misconduct here

To share your story, send an email to k3xhyc4@proton.me

This article is released into the public domain under CC0 1.0 Universal. You are free to republish, copy, syndicate, fork, or remix this content—without attribution and without restriction. No permission required. Journalists, bloggers, watchdogs: you are welcome to syndicate this article in full or in part. No attribution required. Use it in your own reporting, campaigns, archives, or advocacy materials.

License: CC0 1.0 Universal (Public Domain) This work has been released into the public domain under the [Creative Commons CC0 1.0 Universal license](https://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/). You are free to copy, modify, distribute, and use this work—even for commercial purposes—without asking permission.